

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action objected the Drawings, and objected and rejected all presently pending claims 1-11. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker (US 5,379,379) in view of Mills (US 5,497,355) and Pollak (US 6,618,724). Furthermore, the Office Action rejected claims 2-3 as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Mills, Pollak and Mann (US 5,954,813), and the Office Action rejected claim 4 and 9 as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Mills, Pollak and A.A.P.A. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and states clearly how the application distinguishes from the Nagata. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Nagata does not anticipate all pending claims in the application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

The Office Action objected the Specification as having informalities compared with the Drawings. In order to correct the informalities, the Fig.2 and Fig.3 are interchanged instead of interchanging the description in the specification as suggested by the Office Action. It is believed that such amendment makes the Specification conform to the Drawings. The amended

description in paragraph [0018] is added based on the new Fig. 3, such that no new matter is added by this amendment. The amended drawings are attached to this response.

The informalities found and listed as point 4 in the Office Action are corrected as what the Office Action suggested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

[35 USC 112 discussion]

Claim 7 is deleted. However, claim 11 and paragraph [0018] are amended according to the Drawings, and no new matter is entered in the amendment. After the amendment, claim 11 is believed to comply with the written description requirement.

[35 USC 103 discussion]

After entering the amendment in the claims, claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak at least because **there's no suggestions to combine Becker and Mills with Pollak**. More specifically, Becker suggests latching the address of the double word and doing directory look-ups in the following cycle (Becker, column 6, lines 53-55), while Mills suggests combining a row and column address in address latch 530 and releasing them as a single address 570 that can be provided as the single external address (Mills, column 13, lines 8-12). It is concluded that **the address is used by way of a single unit, not a plurality of divided units**. Therefore, the disclosure of **Becker and Mills teaches away using the address in several parts**

and therefore those skilled in the art can not apply the comparison method disclosed in Pollak on combination of Becker and Mills.

Furthermore, the amended claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak at least because the combination of Becker and Mills does not disclose, teach or suggest the feature of "...a bus interface unit coupled to the system bus, wherein said bus interface unit *receives the first section read address and the second section read address of a memory read command* sequentially ... a memory request organizer ... for *comparing said first section read address ... if the comparison indicates the presence of identical bits, said second section read address would be compared ...*" as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, the Becker does not teach the read address is received sequentially by a bus interface unit as a first and second section, and the combination of Becker and Mills does not teach a two-step comparison algorithm **should be performed before the row and column address being combined** in address latch 530. In Mills, the multiplexed addresses 550 are steered by address mux 520, and the steered row and column are combined in address latch 530 and output as a single address 570 that can be provided as the single external address (column 13, lines 3-13). It is very clear that the single address 570 can be provided only after the row address and column address **both** being received, and nothing is mentioned that the row address and the column address can be used in a separate way to perform any function that reduces operation time.

Accordingly, the combination of Becker, Mills and Pollak is not rational because Becker and Mills teach away from using the address for several parts divided by time sequence, and one

is therefore **discouraged to apply two-step comparison method provided by Pollak onto a single address**. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak.

Since claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, claims 5-6, which depend on claim 1 and are rejected basing on the same prior arts, are patentable as a matter of law.

Claim 8 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak at least because the reason stated for claim 1 since both claims contains a feature that can be distinguished from those prior arts and is rejected basing on the same prior arts and reasons, respectively.

Since claim 8 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, claim 10, which depends on claim 8 and is rejected basing on the same prior arts, are patentable as a matter of law.

Claim 2 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann. One of the reasons that claim 2 is patentable is the disclosure of Becker and Mills teaches away from combining with Pollak as stated before. Furthermore, the combination of Becker, Mills and Mann does not disclose the feature of "...comparing said first section read address ... if the comparison indicates the presence of identical bits, said second section read address would be compared..." as recited in claim 1, which is depended by claim 2. More specifically, Becker, Mills and Mann do not disclose to first compare the first section address and then compare the second address if it is necessary. Becker and Mills compare the whole read address and the write address, and therefore it is clear that Becker and Mills do not disclose, even teaching away, to divided the read address into two parts when the read address is used to compare with the write

address. Mann discloses to compare both sections of read address instead of comparing one of the sections first and then comparing the other section when the comparison is necessary. More specifically, Mann discloses in column 6, lines 18-21, “ When set to a binary 1, ... BRKE bit 61 enables the generation ... on 16-bit address matches. When cleared to a binary 0, BRKE bit 61 enables the generation ... on 16-bit address matches.”, and in column 6, lines 48-49, “ Control block 67 activates signal ... if BRKE bit 61 is set and **both inputs are active**, ...”. It can be easily know that the two parts of address are both compared in Mann, and therefore it is different from the feature mentioned above.

Accordingly, claim 2 is therefore patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann as a matter of law at least because the combination of those prior arts does not provide a rational reason to reject claim 1, which is depended by claim 2. For at least the same reason, claim 3 is found patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann as a matter of law.

Claim 4 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of APA. One of the reasons that claim 4 is patentable is the disclosure of Becker and Mills teaches away from combining with Pollak as stated before. Furthermore, the combination of Becker, Mills and Mann does not disclose the feature of “...comparing said first section read address ... if the comparison indicates the presence of identical bits, said second section read address would be compared...” as recited in claim 1, which is depended by claim 4. More specifically, APA does not disclose first compare the first section address and then compare the second address if it

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,454
Docket No.: 8327-US-PA

is necessary. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of APA as a matter of law at least because the combination of those prior arts does not provide a rational reason to reject claim 1, which is depended by claim 4.

Claim 9 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of APA for the same reason as stated for claim 4. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable as a matter of law at least because the combination of those prior arts does not provide a rational reason to reject claim 8, which is depended by claim 9.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 9-11 patently define over the prior art as well.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,454
Docket No.: 8327-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-6 and 8-11 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

February 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw